arXiv:1701.02230v1 [math.AP] 9 Jan 2017

LOWER SEMICONTINUITY AND RELAXATION OF LINEAR-GROWTH INTEGRAL FUNCTIONALS UNDER PDE CONSTRAINTS

ADOLFO ARROYO-RABASA, GUIDO DE PHILIPPIS, AND FILIP RINDLER

ABSTRACT. We show general lower semicontinuity and relaxation theorems for linear-growth integral functionals defined on vector measures that satisfy linear PDE side constraints (of arbitrary order). These results generalize several known lower semicontinuity and relaxation theorems for BV, BD, and for more general first-order linear PDE side constrains. Our proofs are based on recent progress in the understanding of singularities in measure solutions to linear PDE's and of the corresponding generalized convexity classes.

KEYWORDS: Lower semicontinuity, functional on measures, $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvexity, generalized Young measure.

DATE: January 10, 2017.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of linear-growth integral functionals defined on vector-valued measures satisfying PDE constraints is central to many questions of the calculus of variations. In particular, their relaxation and lower semicontinuity properties have attracted a lot of attention, see for instance [AD92, FM93, FM99, FLM04, KR10b, Rin11, BCMS13]. In the present work we unify and extend a large number of these results by proving general lower semicontinuity and relaxation theorems for such functionals. Our proofs are based on recent advances in the understanding of the *singularities* that may occur in measures satisfying (under-determined) linear PDEs.

Concretely, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open and bounded subset with $\mathscr{L}^d(\partial\Omega) = 0$ and consider for a vector Radon measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ on Ω with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ the functional

$$\mathscr{F}^{\#}[\mu] := \int_\Omega f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x). \tag{1.1}$$

Here, $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel integrand that has *linear growth at infinity*, i.e.,

$$|f(x,A)| \le M(1+|A|) \qquad \text{for all } (x,A) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

whereby the *(generalized) recession function*

$$f^{\#}(x,A) := \limsup_{\substack{x' \to x \\ A' \to A \\ t \to \infty}} \frac{f(x',tA')}{t}, \qquad (x,A) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

takes only finite values. Furthermore, on the candidate measures $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ we impose the k'th-order linear PDE side constraint

$$\mathscr{A}\mu := \sum_{|\alpha| \le k} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha \mu = 0 \qquad \text{in the sense of distributions.}$$

The coefficients $A_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times N}$ are assumed to be constant and we write $\partial^\alpha = \partial_1^{\alpha_1}\dots\partial_d^{\alpha_d}$ for every multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_d) \in (\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\})^d$ with $|\alpha| := |\alpha_1|+\dots+|\alpha_d| \le k$. We call measures $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\mathscr{A}\mu = 0$ in the sense of distributions *$\mathscr{A}$-free*.

We will also assume that $\mathscr{A}$ satisfies *Murat's constant rank condition* (see [Mur81, FM99]), that is, we suppose that there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\operatorname{rank}(\ker \mathbb{A}^k(\xi)) = r \qquad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\mathbb{A}^k(\xi) := (2\pi \mathrm{i})^k \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \xi^\alpha A_\alpha, \qquad \xi^\alpha = \xi_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\xi_d^{\alpha_d}$$

is the *principal symbol* of $\mathscr{A}$. We also recall the notion of *wave cone* associated to $\mathscr{A}$, which plays a fundamental role in the study of $\mathscr{A}$-free fields and first originated in the Tartar–Murat theory of compensated compactness [Tar79, Tar83, Mur78, Mur79, Mur81, DiP85].

Definition 1.1. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be k'th-order linear PDE operator as above, $\mathscr{A} := \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha$. The* wave cone *associated to $\mathscr{A}$ is the set*

$$\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} := \bigcup_{|\xi|=1} \ker \mathbb{A}^k(\xi) \subset \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Note that the wave cone contains those amplitudes along which it is possible to construct highly oscillating $\mathscr{A}$-free fields. More precisely if $\mathscr{A}$ is homogeneous, i.e., $\mathscr{A} = \sum_{|\alpha|=k} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha$, then $P \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ if and only if there exists $\xi \neq 0$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}(P h(x\cdot\xi)) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } h \in \mathrm{C}^k(\mathbb{R}).$$

Our first main theorem concerns the case when f is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex in its second argument, where

$$\mathscr{A}^k := \sum_{|\alpha|=k} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha$$

is the *principal part* of $\mathscr{A}$. Recall from [FM99] that a Borel function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *$\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex* if

$$h(A) \le \int_Q h(A + w(y))\,\mathrm{d}y$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and all Q-periodic $w \in \mathrm{C}^\infty(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\mathscr{A}^k w = 0$ and $\int_Q w\,\mathrm{d}y = 0$, where $Q := (-1/2,1/2)^d$ is the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 1.2 (lower semicontinuity). *Let $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N \to [0,\infty)$ be a continuous integrand. Assume that f has linear growth at infinity and is Lipschitz in its second argument, uniformly in x. Assume further that there exists a modulus of continuity ω such that*

$$|f(x,A) - f(y,A)| \le \omega(|x-y|)(1+|A|) \qquad \textit{for all } x,y \in \Omega,\ A \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.3}$$

and that the strong recession function

$$f^\infty(x,A) := \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{f(x,tA)}{t} \quad \textit{exists for all} \quad (x,A) \in \Omega \times \operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}. \tag{1.4}$$

Then, the functional

$$\mathscr{F}[\mu] := \int_\Omega f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^\infty\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x)$$

is sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous for measures in the space*

$$\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A} := \left\{\,\mu\in\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\ :\ \mathscr{A}\mu=0\,\right\}$$

if and only if $f(x,\cdot)$ is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex for every $x\in\Omega$.

Note that according to (1.7) below, $\mathscr{F}[\mu]$ is well defined. Since the strong recession function is computed only at amplitudes that belong to $\operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Remark 1.3. The conclusion of Theorem 1.2 extends to sequences such that $\mathscr{A}\mu_j\to 0$ strongly in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $1<q<d/(d-1)$.

Notice that f^∞ in (1.4) is a limit, and differently from $f^\#$, it may fail to exist for $A\in(\operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}})\setminus\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ (for $A\in\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ the existence of $f^\infty(x,A)$ follows from the $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity, see Corollary 2.19). If we remove the assumption that f^∞ exists for points in the subspace generated by the wave cone $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$, we still have the following partial lower semicontinuity result (cf. [FLM04]).

Theorem 1.4 (partial lower semicontinuity). *Let $f\colon\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N\to[0,\infty)$ be a continuous integrand. Assume that f has linear growth at infinity and is Lipschitz in its second argument, uniformly in x. Assume further that there exists a modulus of continuity ω such that*

$$|f(x,A)-f(y,A)|\le\omega(|x-y|)(1+|A|)\qquad\text{for all } x,y\in\Omega,\ A\in\mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.5}$$

Then,

$$\int_\Omega f\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x\le\left\{\liminf_{j\to\infty}\mathscr{F}^\#[\mu_j]\ :\ \mu_j\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}\mu\text{ and }\mathscr{A}\mu_j\to 0\text{ in }\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}\right\},$$

where

$$\mathscr{F}^\#[\mu]:=\int_\Omega f\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega f^\#\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x).$$

Remark 1.5. As special cases of Theorem 1.2 we get, among others, the following well-known results:

(i) For $\mathscr{A}=\operatorname{curl}$, one obtains BV-lower semicontinuity results in the spirit of Ambrosio–Dal Maso [AD92] and Fonseca–Müller [FM93], also see [KR10b] for the case of signed integrands.

(ii) For $\mathscr{A}=\operatorname{curl}\operatorname{curl}$, where

$$\operatorname{curl}\operatorname{curl}\mu:=\left(\sum_{i=1}^d\partial_{ik}\mu_i^j+\partial_{ij}\mu_i^k-\partial_{jk}\mu_i^i-\partial_{ii}\mu_j^k\right)_{j,k=1,\dots,d}$$

is the second order operator expressing the Saint-Venant compatibility conditions (see [FM99, Example 3.10(e)]), we re-prove the lower semicontinuity and relaxation theorem in the space of functions of bounded deformation (BD) from [Rin11].

(iii) For first-order operators $\mathscr{A}$, a similar result was proved in [BCMS13].

(iv) Earlier work in this direction is in [FM99, FLM04], but did not consider the singular part (concentration of measure).

If we dispense with the assumption of $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity on the integrand, we have the following two relaxation results:

Theorem 1.6 (relaxation). *Let $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N\to[0,\infty)$ be a continuous integrand that is Lipschitz in its second argument (uniformly in x), has linear growth at infinity, and is such that there exists a modulus of continuity ω as in (1.5). Further we assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is a homogeneous partial differential operator and that the strong recession function*

$$f^\infty(x,A)\quad \text{exists for all}\quad (x,A)\in\Omega\times\operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}.$$

Then, for the functional

$$\mathscr{G}[u]:=\int_\Omega f(x,u(x))\,\mathrm{d}x,\qquad u\in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

the (sequentially) weakly lower semicontinuous envelope*

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[\mu]:=\inf\Big\{\liminf_{j\to\infty}\mathscr{G}[u_j]\ :\ u_j\mathscr{L}^d\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}\mu \text{ and } \mathscr{A}u_j\to 0 \text{ in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}\Big\}$$

is given by

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[\mu]=\int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}}f\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}}f)^{\#}\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

where $Q_{\mathscr{A}}f(x,\cdot)$ denotes the $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex envelope of $f(x,\cdot)$ with respect to the second argument (see Definition 2.16 below).

If we want to relax in the space $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}$ we need to assume that $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}$ is dense in $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}$ with respect to a finer topology than the natural weak* topology (in this context also see [AR16]).

Theorem 1.7. *Let $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N\to[0,\infty)$ be a continuous integrand that is Lipschitz in its second argument (uniformly in x), has linear growth at infinity, and is such that there exists a modulus of continuity ω as in (1.5). Further assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is a homogeneous partial differential operator and that the strong recession function*

$$f^\infty(x,A)\quad \text{exists for all}\quad (x,A)\in\Omega\times\operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}.$$

If for all $\mu\in\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\mathscr{A}\mu=0$ there exists a sequence $(u_j)\subset\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}$ such that

$$u_j\mathscr{L}^d\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}\mu\quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\quad\text{and}\quad \langle u_j\mathscr{L}^d\rangle(\Omega)\to\langle\mu\rangle(\Omega),\tag{1.6}$$

where $\langle\cdot\rangle$ is the area functional defined in (2.2), then the weakly lower semicontinuous envelope of the functional*

$$\mathscr{G}[u]:=\int_\Omega f(x,u(x))\,\mathrm{d}x,\qquad u\in\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A},$$

with respect to weak-convergence in the space $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}$, is given by*

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[\mu]=\int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}}f\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}}f)^{\#}\left(x,\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x).$$

Remark 1.8 (density assumptions). Condition (1.6) is automatically fulfilled in the following cases:

(i) For $\mathscr{A}=\operatorname{curl}$, the approximation property (for general domains) is proved in the appendix of [KR10a] (also see Lemma B.1 of [Bil03] for Lipschitz domains). The same argument further shows the area-strict approximation property in the BD-case (also see Lemma 2.2 in [BFT00] for a result which covers the strict convergence).

(ii) If Ω is a *strictly star-shaped* domain, i.e., there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that

$$\overline{(\Omega - x_0)} \subset t(\Omega - x_0) \qquad \text{for all } t > 1,$$

then (1.6) holds for every homogeneous operator $\mathscr{A}$. Indeed, for $t > 1$ we can consider the dilation of μ defined on $t(\Omega - x_0)$ and then mollify it at a sufficiently small scale. We refer for instance to [Mül87] for details.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.7 and of Remark 1.8 we explicitly state the following corollary, which extends the lower semicontinuity result of [Rin11] into a full relaxation result. The only other relaxation result in this direction, albeit for *special* functions of bounded deformation, seems to be in [BFT00], other results in this area are discussed in [Rin11] and the references therein.

Corollary 1.9. *Let $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to [0,\infty)$ be a continuous integrand that is uniformly Lipschitz in its second argument, has linear growth at infinity, and is such that there exists a modulus of continuity ω as in (1.5). Further assume that the strong recession function*

$$f^\infty(x,A) \quad \textit{exists for all} \quad (x,A) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{\mathrm{sym}}.$$

Let us consider the functional

$$\mathscr{G}[u] := \int_\Omega f(x, \mathscr{E}u(x))\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

defined for $u \in \mathrm{LD}(\Omega) := \{u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega) \ :\ E^s u = 0\}$, where $Eu := (Du + Du^T)/2 \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ is the symmetrized distributional derivative of $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ and where

$$Eu = \mathscr{E}u\,\mathscr{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + \frac{\mathrm{d}E^s u}{\mathrm{d}|E^s u|}|E^s u|,$$

is its Radon–Nikodým decomposition with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$.

Then, the lower semicontinuous envelope of $\mathscr{G}[u]$ with respect to weak-convergence in $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, is given by the functional*

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[u] := \int_\Omega SQf(x,\mathscr{E}u(x))\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (SQf)^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}E^s u}{\mathrm{d}|E^s u|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|E^s u|(x),$$

where SQf denotes the symmetric-quasiconvex envelope *of f with respect to the second argument (i.e., the* curl curl*-quasiconvex envelope of $f(x,\cdot)$ in the sense of Definition 2.16).*

Our proofs are fairly concise and based on new tools to study singularities in PDE-constrained measures. Concretely, we exploit the recent developments on the structure of $\mathscr{A}$-free measures obtained in [DR16b]. In particular, the study of the singular part – up to now the most complicated argument in the proof – now only requires a fairly straightforward (classical) convexity argument. More precisely, the main theorem of [KK16] establishes that the restriction of $f^{\#}$ to the linear space spanned by the wave cone is in fact *convex* at all points of $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ (in the sense that a supporting hyperplane exists). Moreover, by [DR16b],

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \qquad \text{for } |\mu^s|\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{1.7}$$

Thus, combining these two assertions, we gain classical convexity for $f^{\#}$ at singular points, which can be exploited via the theory of generalized Young measures developed in [DM87, AB97, KR10a].

Remark 1.10 (different notions of recession function). Note that both in Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.6 the existence of the *strong* recession function f^∞ is assumed, in contrast with the results in [AD92, FM93, BCMS13] where this is not imposed.

The need for this assumption comes from the use of Young measure techniques which seem to be better suited to deal with the singular part of the measure, as we already discussed above. In the aforementioned references a direct blow up approach is instead performed and this allows to deal directly with the functional in (1.1). The blow up techniques, however, rely strongly on the fact that $\mathscr{A}$ is a homogeneous first-order operator. Indeed, it is not hard to check that for all "elementary" $\mathscr{A}$-free measures of the form

$$\mu = P_0\lambda, \qquad \text{where} \qquad P_0 \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}},\ \lambda \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

the scalar measure λ is necessarily translation invariant along orthogonal directions to the *characteristic set*

$$\Xi(P_0) := \{\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \ :\ P_0 \in \ker \mathbb{A}(\xi) \,\},$$

which turns out to be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ whenever $\mathscr{A}$ is a first-order operator. The subspace structure and the aforementioned translation invariance is then used to perform homogenization-type arguments. Due to the lack of linearity of the map

$$\xi \mapsto \mathbb{A}^k(\xi) \quad \text{for } k > 1,$$

the structure of elementary $\mathscr{A}$-free measures for general operators is more complicated and not yet fully understood (see however [Rin11, DR16a] for the case $\mathscr{A} = \operatorname{curl}\operatorname{curl}$).This prevents, at the moment, the use of a "pure" blow-up techniques and forces us to pass through the combination of the results of [DR16b, KK16] with the Young measure approach.

This paper is organized as follows: First, in Section 2, we introduce all the necessary notation and prove a few auxiliary results. Then, in Section 3, we establish the central Jensen-type inequalities, which immediately yield the proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 in Section 4. The proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 are given in Section 5.

Acknowledgments. A. A.-R. is supported by a scholarship from the Hausdorff Center of Mathematics and the University of Bonn; the research conducted in this paper forms part of the first author's Ph.D. thesis at the University of Bonn. G. D. P. is supported by the MIUR SIR-grant "Geometric Variational Problems" (RBSI14RVEZ). F. R. acknowledges the support from an EPSRC Research Fellowship on "Singularities in Nonlinear PDEs" (EP/L018934/1).

2. Notation and preliminaries

We write $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ to denote the space of finite and locally finite vector Radon measures on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. We write the Radon–Nikodým decomposition of $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ as

$$\mu = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}\,\mathscr{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + \mu^s, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d} \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mu^s \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is singular with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$.

In order to keep a simple presentation, we will often identify $u \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the measure $u\mathscr{L}^d \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.

2.1. **Integrands and Young measures.** For $f \in \mathrm{C}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N)$ define the transformation

$$(Sf)(x,\hat{A}) := (1-|\hat{A}|) f\left(x, \frac{\hat{A}}{1-|\hat{A}|}\right), \qquad x \in \overline{\Omega}, \hat{A} \in \mathbb{B}^N,$$

where $\mathbb{B}^N$ denotes the open unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then, $Sf \in \mathrm{C}(\Omega \times \mathbb{B}^N)$. We set

$$\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) := \left\{ f \in \mathrm{C}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N) \ : \ Sf \text{ extends to } \mathrm{C}(\overline{\Omega \times \mathbb{B}^N}) \right\}.$$

In particular, all $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ have linear growth at infinity, i.e., there exists a positive constant M such that $|f(x,A)| \le M(1+|A|)$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$. With the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)} := \|Sf\|_\infty, \qquad f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

the space $\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ turns out to be a Banach space. Also, by definition, for each $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ the limit

$$f^\infty(x,A) := \lim_{\substack{x' \to x \\ A' \to A \\ t \to \infty}} \frac{f(x',tA')}{t}, \qquad x \in \overline{\Omega}, A \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

exists and defines a positively 1-homogeneous function called the *strong recession function* of f. Even if one drops the dependence on x, the recession function h^∞ might not exist for $h \in \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Instead, one can always define the *generalized recession functions*

$$f^\#(x,A) := \limsup_{\substack{x' \to x \\ A' \to A \\ t \to \infty}} \frac{f(x',tA')}{t},$$

$$f_\#(x,A) := \liminf_{\substack{x' \to x \\ A' \to A \\ t \to \infty}} \frac{f(x',tA')}{t},$$

which again turn out to be positively 1-homogeneous. If f is x-uniformly Lipschitz continuous in the A-variable and there exists a modulus of continuity $\omega\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ (increasing, continuous, and $\omega(0)=0$) such that

$$|f(x,A) - f(y,A)| \le \omega(|x-y|)(1+|A|), \qquad x,y \in \Omega, A \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

then the definitions of f^∞ and $f^\#$ (and $f_\#$) simplify to

$$f^\infty(x,A) := \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{f(x,tA)}{t},$$

$$f^\#(x,A) := \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{f(x,tA)}{t}.$$

A natural action of $\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ on the space $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is given by

$$\mu \mapsto \int_\Omega f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^N}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^\infty\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x).$$

In particular, for $f(x,A) = \sqrt{1+|A|^2} \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ – for which $f^\infty(A) = |A|$, we define the *area functional*

$$\langle \mu \rangle(\Omega) := \int_\Omega \sqrt{1 + \left|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^N}\right|^2}\, \mathrm{d}x + |\mu^s|(\Omega), \qquad \mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{2.2}$$

In addition to the well-known weak* convergence of measures, we say that a sequence (μ_j) *converges area-strictly* to μ in $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ if

$$\mu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu \text{ in } \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle \mu_j\rangle(\Omega) \to \langle \mu\rangle(\Omega),$$

in which case we write "$\mu_j \to \mu$ area-strictly".

This notion of convergence turns out to be stronger than the conventional *strict convergence* of measures, which means that

$$\mu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\mu_j|(\Omega) \to |\mu|(\Omega).$$

Indeed, the area-strict convergence, as opposed to the usual strict convergence, prohibits one-dimensional oscillations. The meaning of area-strict convergence becomes clear when considering the following version of Reshetnyak's continuity theorem, which entails that the topology generated by area-strict convergence is the coarsest topology under which the natural action of $\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ on $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuous.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 5 in [KR10b]). *For every integrand $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, the functional*

$$\mu \mapsto \int_\Omega f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^N}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^\infty\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

is area-strictly continuous on $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Remark 2.2. Notice that if $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$, then $\mu_\varepsilon \to \mu$ area-strictly, where μ_ε is the mollification of μ with a family of standard convolution kernels, $\mu_\varepsilon := \mu * \rho_\varepsilon$ and $\rho_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-d}\rho(x/\varepsilon)$ for $\rho \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(B_1)$ positive and even function satisfying $\int \rho \,\mathrm{d}x = 1$.

Generalized Young measures form a set of dual objects to the integrands in $\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$. We recall briefly some aspects of this theory, which was introduced by DiPerna and Majda in [DM87] and later extended in [AB97, KR10a].

Definition 2.3 (generalized Young measure). *A generalized Young measure, parametrized by an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ is a triple $(\nu_x, \lambda_\nu, \nu_x^\infty)$, where*

(i) *$(\nu_x)_{x\in\Omega} \subset \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a parametrized family of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^N$,*

(ii) *$\lambda_\nu \in \mathscr{M}_+(\overline{\Omega})$ is a positive finite Radon measure on $\overline{\Omega}$, and*

(iii) *$(\nu_x^\infty)_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} \subset \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})$ is a parametrized family of probability measures on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$.*

Additionally, we require that

(iv) *the map $x \mapsto \nu_x$ is weakly* measurable with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$,*

(v) *the map $x \mapsto \nu_x^\infty$ is weakly* measurable with respect to λ_ν, and*

(vi) *$x \mapsto \langle |\bullet|, \nu_x\rangle \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)$.*

The set of all such Young measures is denoted by $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Here, weak* measurability means that the functions $x \mapsto \langle f(x,\bullet), \nu_x\rangle$ (respectively $x \mapsto \langle f^\infty(x,\bullet), \nu_x^\infty\rangle$) are Lebesgue measurable (respectively λ_ν-measurable) for all Carathéodory integrands $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ (measurable in their first argument and continuous in their second argument).

For an integrand $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and a Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, we define the *duality paring* between f and ν as follows:

$$\langle\!\langle f, \nu \rangle\!\rangle := \int_\Omega \langle f(x,\cdot), \nu_x \rangle \, \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle f^\infty(x,\cdot), \nu_x^\infty \rangle \, \mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu(x).$$

In many cases it will be sufficient to work with functions $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ which are Lipschitz continuous. The following density lemma can be found in [KR10a, Lemma 3]:

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a countable set of functions $\{f_m\} = \{\varphi_m \otimes h_m \in \mathrm{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \times \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^N) : m \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that for two Young measures $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ the implication*

$$\langle\!\langle f_m, \nu_1 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle f_m, \nu_2 \rangle\!\rangle \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \nu_1 = \nu_2$$

holds. Moreover, all the h_m can be chosen to be Lipschitz continuous.

Since $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is contained in the dual space of $\mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ via the duality pairing $\langle\!\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\!\rangle$, we say that a sequence of Young measures $(\nu_j) \subset \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ *converges weakly** to $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, in symbols $\nu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu$, if

$$\langle\!\langle f, \nu_j \rangle\!\rangle \to \langle\!\langle f, \nu \rangle\!\rangle \qquad \text{for all } f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Fundamental for all Young measure theory is the following compactness result, see [KR10a, Section 3.1] for a proof:

Lemma 2.5 (compactness). *Let $(\nu_j) \subset \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a sequence of Young measures satisfying*

(i) *the functions $x \mapsto \langle |\cdot|, \nu_j \rangle$ are uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)$,*

(ii) $\sup_j \lambda_{\nu_j}(\overline{\Omega}) < \infty$.

Then, there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) and $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\nu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu$ in $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Young measures generated by means of periodic homogenization can be easily computed, see [BM84].

Lemma 2.6 (oscillation measures). *Let $w \in \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a Q-periodic function and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the (Q/m)-periodic functions*

$$w_m(x) := w(mx).$$

Then,

$$w_m \rightharpoonup \overline{w}(x) := \int_Q w(y) \, \mathrm{d}y \quad \text{in } \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

for every measurable $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Moreover, the sequence $(w_m) \subset \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ generates the homogeneous (local) Young measure $\nu = (\overline{\delta_w}, 0, \delta_0) \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ (a Young measure restricted to every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$), where

$$\langle h, \overline{\delta_w} \rangle := \int_Q h(w(y)) \, \mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ with linear growth at infinity}.$$

The Radon–Nikodým decomposition (2.1) induces a natural embedding of $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ into $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) : \mu \mapsto \delta[\mu]$, via the identification

$$(\delta[\mu])_x := \delta_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)}, \qquad \lambda_{\delta[\mu]} := |\mu^s|, \qquad (\delta[\mu])^\infty_x := \delta_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)}.$$

In this sense, we say that the sequence of measures (μ_j) *generates* the Young measure ν if $\delta[\mu_h] \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu$ in $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, in symbols

$$\mu_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu.$$

The barycenter $[\nu] \in \mathscr{M}(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^N)$ of a Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined as

$$[\nu] := \left\langle\!\left\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu \right\rangle\!\right\rangle = \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_x \rangle \, \mathscr{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_x \rangle \, \lambda_\nu.$$

Using the notation above it is clear that for $(\mu_j) \subset \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ it holds that $\mu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} [\nu]$ as measures on $\overline{\Omega}$ if $\mu_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu$.

Remark 2.7. For a sequence $(\mu_j) \subset \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ that area-strictly converges to some limit $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, it is relatively easy to characterize the (unique) Young measure it generates. Indeed, an immediate consequence of the Separation Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.1 is that

$$\mu_j \to \mu \text{ area-strictly in } \Omega \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \mu_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \delta[\mu] \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

In some cases it will be necessary to determine the smallest linear space containing the support of a Young measure. With this aim in mind, we state the following version of Theorem 2.5 in [AB97]:

Lemma 2.8. *Let (u_j) be a sequence in $\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ generating a Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and let V be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $u_j(x) \in V$ for $\mathscr{L}^d$-a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Then,*

(i) $\operatorname{supp} \nu_x \subset V$ *for $\mathscr{L}^d$-a.e. $x \in \Omega$,*

(ii) $\operatorname{supp} \nu^\infty_x \subset V \cap \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ *for λ_ν-a.e. $x \in \Omega$.*

Finally, we have the following approximation lemma, see [AB97, Lemma 2.3] for a proof.

Lemma 2.9. *For every upper semicontinuous Borel integrand $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ with linear growth at infinity, there exists a decreasing sequence $(f_m) \subset \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the form $f_m = \sum_{j=1}^{l(m)} \varphi_j \otimes h_j$ (with the choices of φ_j, h_j depending on m) with*

$$\inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}} f_m = \lim_{m\to\infty} f_m = f, \qquad \inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}} f^\infty_m = \lim_{m\to\infty} f^\infty_m = f^\# \qquad \text{(pointwise)}.$$

Furthermore, the linear growth constants of the h_j can be chosen to be bounded by the linear growth constant of f.

By approximation, we thus get:

Corollary 2.10. *Let $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be an upper semicontinuous Borel integrand. Then the functional*

$$\nu \mapsto \int_\Omega \langle f(x,\cdot), \nu_x \rangle \, \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \langle f^\#(x,\cdot), \nu^\infty_x \rangle \, \mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu(x)$$

is sequentially weakly upper semicontinuous on $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

Similarly, if $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$ is a lower semicontinuous Borel integrand, then the functional

$$\nu \mapsto \int_\Omega \langle f(x,\cdot),\nu_x\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \langle f_\#(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu(x)$$

is sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous on $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

2.2. **Tangent measures.** In this section we recall the notion of tangent measures, as introduced by Preiss [Pre87] (with the exception that we always include the zero measure as a tangent measure).

Let $\mu\in\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and consider the map $T^{(x_0,r)}(x) := (x-x_0)/r$, which blows up $B_r(x_0)$, the open ball around $x_0\in\Omega$ with radius $r>0$, into the open unit ball B_1. The *push-forward* of μ under $T^{(x_0,r)}$ is given by the measure

$$T^{(x_0,r)}_\#\mu(B) := \mu(x_0+rB), \qquad B\subset r^{-1}(\Omega-x_0) \text{ a Borel set.}$$

We say that ν is a *tangent measure* to μ at a point $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d$ if there exist sequences $r_m>0$, $c_m>0$ with $r_m\downarrow 0$ such that

$$c_m T^{(x_0,r_m)}_\#\mu \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

The set of all such tangent measures is denoted by $\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0)$ and the sequence $c_m T^{(x_0,r_m)}_\#\mu$ is called a *blow-up sequence*. Using the canonical zero extension that maps the space $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ into the space $\mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ we may use most of the results contained in the general theory for tangent measures when dealing with tangent measures defined on smaller domains.

Since we will frequently restrict tangent measures to the unit d-dimensional unit cube $Q := (-1/2,1/2)^d$, we set

$$\mathrm{Tan}_Q(\mu,x_0) := \big\{\, \sigma\llcorner Q \;:\; \sigma\in\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0)\,\big\}.$$

One can show (see Remark 14.4 in [Mat95]) that for any non-zero $\sigma\in\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0)$ it is always possible to choose the scaling constants $c_m>0$ in the blow-up sequence to be

$$c_m := c\mu(x_0+r_mU)^{-1}$$

for any open and bounded set $U\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ containing the origin and with the property that $\sigma(U)>0$, for some positive constant $c=c(U)$ (this may involve passing to a subsequence).

A special property of tangent measures is that at $|\mu|$-almost every $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d$ it holds that

$$\sigma = \text{w*-}\lim_{m\to\infty} c_m T^{(x_0,r_m)}_\#\mu \quad\Longleftrightarrow\quad |\sigma| = \text{w*-}\lim_{m\to\infty} c_m T^{(x_0,r_m)}_\#|\mu|, \tag{2.3}$$

where the (local*) weak* limits are to be understood in the spaces $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mathscr{M}^+_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively. A proof of this fact can be found in Theorem 2.44 of [AFP00]. In particular, this implies

$$\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}(x_0)\cdot\mathrm{Tan}(|\mu|,x_0).$$

If $\mu,\lambda\in\mathscr{M}^+_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are two Radon measures with the property that $\mu\ll\lambda$, i.e., that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to λ, then (see Lemma 14.6 of [Mat95])

$$\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0) = \mathrm{Tan}(\lambda,x_0) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, at every $x_0 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$ such that

$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B_r(x_0)\setminus E)}{\mu(B_r(x_0))} = 0$$

for some Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that

$$\operatorname{Tan}(\mu, x_0) = \operatorname{Tan}(\mu \llcorner E, x_0).$$

A simple consequence of (2.4) is

$$\operatorname{Tan}(|\mu|, x_0) = \operatorname{Tan}\left(\mathscr{L}^d, x_0\right) \qquad \text{for } \frac{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}\,\mathscr{L}^d\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This implies

$$\operatorname{Tan}(\mu, x_0) = \left\{ \alpha \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d \;:\; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \right\} \quad \text{for } \mathscr{L}^d\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.5}$$

We shall refer to such points as *regular points* of μ (as any blow-up measure is a multiple of the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure). Furthermore, for every regular point x_0 there exists a sequence $r_m \downarrow 0$ and a positive constant c such that

$$c r_m^{-d} (T_\#^{(x_0, r_m)}\mu) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

2.3. **Rigidity results.** As discussed in the introduction, for a linear operator $\mathscr{A} := \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha$, the wave cone

$$\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} := \bigcup_{|\xi|=1} \ker \mathbb{A}^k(\xi) \quad \subset \mathbb{R}^N$$

contains those amplitudes along which is possible to have "one-directional" oscillations or concentrations, or equivalently, it contains the amplitudes along which the system loses its ellipticity.

The main result of [DR16b] asserts that the polar vector of the singular part of an $\mathscr{A}$-free measure μ necessarily has to lie in $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$:

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set and let $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Radon measure on Ω with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$, i.e.,*

$$\mathscr{A}\mu = 0 \quad \textit{in the sense of distributions}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}|\mu|}(x) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \qquad \textit{for } |\mu^s|\textit{-a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Remark 2.12. The proof of this result does not require $\mathscr{A}$ to satisfy Murat's constant rank condition (1.2). However, for the present work, this requirement cannot be dispensed with in the following decomposition by Fonseca and Müller [FM99, Lemma 2.14], where it is needed for the Fourier projection arguments.

Lemma 2.13 (projection). *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a homogeneous differential operator with constant coefficients. For every $1 < p < \infty$, there exists a linear projection operator*

$$\mathscr{P} : \mathrm{L}^p_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \to \mathrm{L}^p_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$$

such that there exists $c_p > 0$ with

$$\mathscr{A}(\mathscr{P}u) = 0, \qquad \int_Q \mathscr{P}u \,\mathrm{d}y = 0, \qquad \|u - \mathscr{P}u\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)} \le c_p \|\mathscr{A}u\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,p}(Q)},$$

for every $u \in \mathrm{L}^p_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ *with* $\int_Q u\,dy = 0$.

Essentially, Lemma 2.13 implies that every Q-periodic $u \in \mathrm{L}^p(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $p > 1$ and mean value zero can be decomposed as the sum

$$u = v + w, \qquad v = \mathscr{P}u,$$

where

$$\mathscr{A}v = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|w\|_{\mathrm{L}^p(Q)} \le c_p \|\mathscr{A}u\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,p}(Q)}.$$

A crucial issue in lower semicontinuity problems is the understanding of oscillation and concentration effects in weakly (weakly*) convergent sequences. In our setting, we are interested in sequences of asymptotically $\mathscr{A}$-free measures generating what we naturally term *$\mathscr{A}$-free Young measures*. The study of general $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measures can be reduced to understanding oscillations in the class of *periodic* $\mathscr{A}$-free fields. This is expressed in the next lemma, which is a variant of Proposition 3.1 in [FLM04] for higher-order operators (see also Lemma 2.20 in [BCMS13]).

Lemma 2.14 (periodic generators). *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be as in Lemma 2.13 and let $(u_j), (v_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^1(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be sequences such that*

$$u_j - v_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{and} \qquad |u_j| + |v_j| \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \Lambda \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}^+(\overline{Q})$$

with $\Lambda(\partial Q) = 0$ and

$$\mathscr{A}(u_j - v_j) \to 0 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{for some } 1 < q < d/(d-1).$$

If the sequence (u_j) generates the Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$, then there exists another sequence $(z_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}z_j = 0, \qquad \int_Q z_j = 0, \qquad z_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

and (up to taking a subsequence of the v_j's) the sequence $(v_j + z_j)$ also generates the Young measure ν, i.e.,

$$(v_j + z_j) \overset{\mathbf{Y}}{\to} \nu \quad \text{in } \mathbf{Y}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Proof. Consider a family of cut-off functions $\psi_m \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(Q;[0,1])$ with $\psi_m \equiv 1$ in the set $\{y \in Q \,:\, \operatorname{dist}(y,\partial Q) > 1/m\}$ and define

$$w^m_j := \psi_m(u_j - v_j).$$

It is not hard to see that $\mathrm{w}^*\text{-}\lim_j w^m_j = 0$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Further,

$$\mathscr{A}w^m_j = \psi_m \mathscr{A}(u_j - v_j) + \sum_{|\beta|\ge 1} c_{\alpha\beta} A_\alpha \partial^{\alpha-\beta}(u_j - v_j)\partial^\beta \psi_m \tag{2.6}$$

where $c_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{N}$. The convergence $u_j - v_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0$ and the compact embedding $\mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \overset{c}{\hookrightarrow} \mathrm{W}^{-1,q}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ entail, via (2.6), the strong convergence

$$\mathscr{A}w^m_j \to 0 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{as } j \to \infty.$$

After mollification and taking into account Remarks 2.2 and 2.7, we may assume without loss of generality that $w^m_j \in \mathrm{L}^q \cap \mathrm{L}^2$ for every $j, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\tilde{w}_j^m := w_j^m - \fint_Q w_j^m \,\mathrm{d}x$ and $z_j^m := \mathscr{P}\tilde{w}_j^m$. It follows from Lemma 2.13 that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{j\to\infty} \|w_j^m - z_j^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(Q)} &\le \lim_{j\to\infty} \|\tilde{w}_j^m - z_j^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^q(Q)} + \lim_{j\to\infty} \left| \int_Q w_j^m \,\mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &\le c_q \lim_{j\to\infty} \|\mathscr{A} w_j^m\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q)} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where in the first inequality we have exploited that $\mathscr{L}^d(Q) = 1$. Fix $\varphi \otimes g \in \mathrm{C}(\overline{Q}) \times \mathrm{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\varphi \otimes g \in \mathbf{E}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$. Using the Lipschitz continuity of g, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q \varphi\, g(u_j)\,\mathrm{d}y &= \int_Q \varphi\, g(u_j - v_j + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\ge \int_Q \varphi\, g(w_j^m + v_j) - \|\varphi\|_\infty \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(g) \cdot \int_Q |1-\psi_m|(|u_j| + |v_j|)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\ge \int_Q \varphi\, g(z_j^m + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\qquad - \|\varphi\|_\infty \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(g) \cdot \left(\int_Q |1-\psi_m|(|u_j| + |v_j|)\,\mathrm{d}y + \|w_j^m - z_j^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(Q)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit as $j \to \infty$ in the previous inequality we obtain, by (2.7), the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(u_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \ge \liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(z_j^m + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ - \|\varphi\|_\infty \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(g) \cdot \Lambda\left(\overline{Q} \setminus Q_{(m-1)/m}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where $Q_r := rQ$ for $r > 0$. A similar relation holds by taking the upper bound of g instead; we get

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(u_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \le \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(z_j^m + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ + \|\varphi\|_\infty \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(g) \cdot \Lambda\left(\overline{Q} \setminus Q_{(m-1)/m}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Combining (2.8), (2.9) and using that $\Lambda(\partial Q) = 0$, we first let $j \to \infty$ and then $m \to \infty$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{m\to\infty} \liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(z_j^m + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y &\le \lim_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(u_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\le \lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi\, g(z_j^m + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\{\varphi_m \otimes g_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences of integrands appearing in Lemma 2.4. By a diagonalization argument we may find a sequence $(z_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^q_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$ such that

$$\int_Q z_j \,\mathrm{d}y = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad z_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

and, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi_m\, g_m(z_j + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \le \lim_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi_m\, g_m(u_j)\,\mathrm{d}y \le \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi_m\, g_m(z_j + v_j)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{2.10}$$

Since $(z_j + v_j)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathrm{L}^1(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$, by Lemma 2.5 we may assume (possibly after passing to a further subsequence) that $z_j + v_j \overset{\mathbf{Y}}{\to} \tilde{\nu} \in \mathbf{Y}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$. In

particular, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi_m g_m(z_j + v_j) = \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_Q \varphi_m g_m(z_j + v_j) = \big\langle\!\big\langle \varphi \otimes g, \tilde{\nu} \big\rangle\!\big\rangle.$$

By combining the above inequality with (2.10) we obtain

$$\big\langle\!\big\langle \varphi_m \otimes g_m, \tilde{\nu} \big\rangle\!\big\rangle = \big\langle\!\big\langle \varphi_m \otimes g_m, \nu \big\rangle\!\big\rangle.$$

where ν is the Young measure generated by u_j. Lemma 2.4 now gives $\nu = \tilde{\nu}$. □

In the sequel we will also need the following simple fact:

Proposition 2.15 (high-order oscillations). *Let (γ_m) be any blow-up sequence of an $\mathscr{A}$-free measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, i.e.,*

$$\gamma_m = c_m T_\#^{(x_0,r_m)} \mu \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

for some $x_0 \in \Omega$, $r_m \downarrow 0$, $c_m > 0$, and $\nu \in \mathrm{Tan}(\mu, x_0)$. Then,

$$\mathscr{A}^k \gamma_m \to 0 \quad \text{locally in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Proof. A change of variables and the $\mathscr{A}$-freeness of μ yield

$$\mathscr{A}^k(T_\#^{(x_0,r_m)}\mu) = -\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \mathscr{A}^l(r_m^{k-l} T_\#^{(x_0,r_m)}\mu), \tag{2.11}$$

in the sense of distributions. Since $r_m^{k-l}\gamma_m \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0$ in $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ as $m \to \infty$ whenever $l < k$, the compact embedding $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{W}^{-1,q}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ entails the strong convergence

$$r^{k-l}\gamma_m \to 0 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-1,q}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d\ \mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{for every } l = 1,\dots,k-1.$$

Hence,

$$\mathscr{A}^l(r^{k-l}\gamma_m) \to 0 \quad \text{locally in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\mathbb{R}^d\ \mathbb{R}^N) \tag{2.12}$$

for every $l = 1,\dots,k-1$. The assertion then follows from (2.11) and (2.12). □

We shall denote the subspace generated by the wave cone $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ by

$$V_{\mathscr{A}} := \operatorname{span} \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Using Fourier series, it is relatively easy to understand the rigidity of $\mathscr{A}^k$-free periodic fields. To fix ideas, let u be a Q-periodic field in $\mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}^k$ with mean value zero (or equivalently $\hat{u}(0) = 0$). Applying the Fourier transform to $\mathscr{A}^k u = 0$, we find that

$$0 = \mathscr{F}(\mathscr{A}^k u)(\xi) = \mathbb{A}^k(\xi)\hat{u}(\xi) \qquad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Hence, $\hat{u}(\xi) \in \ker_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{A}^k(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (here, $\mathbb{A}^k(\xi)$ is understood as a complex-valued tensor). In particular,

$$\big\{\, \hat{u}(\xi) \ :\ \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d \,\big\} \subset \mathbb{C}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}.$$

Since u is a real vector-valued function, it immediately follows that

$$u \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(Q; V_{\mathscr{A}}). \tag{2.13}$$

Using a density argument one can show that, up to a constant term, also functions in $\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}^k$ take values only in $V_{\mathscr{A}}$. The relevance of this observation will be used later in conjunction with Lemma 2.14 in Lemma 3.2.

2.4. $\mathscr{A}$**-quasiconvexity.** We state some well-known and some more recent results regarding the properties of $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex integrands. This notion was first introduced by Morrey [Mor66] in the case of curl-free vector fields, where it is known as *quasiconvexity*, and later extended by Dacorogna [Dac82] and Fonseca–Müller [FM99] to general linear PDE-constraints.

A Borel function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *$\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex* if

$$h(A) \leq \int_Q h(A + w(y))\,\mathrm{d}y$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and all Q-periodic $w \in \mathrm{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}w = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_Q w\,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

For functions h which are not $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex one may define the largest $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex function below h (see Lemma 2.17 below the definition).

Definition 2.16 ($\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex envelope). *Given a Borel function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex envelope of h at $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as*

$$(Q_{\mathscr{A}}h)(A) := \inf\left\{ \int_Q h(A + w(y))\,\mathrm{d}y \;:\; w \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A},\ \int_Q w\,\mathrm{d}y = 0 \right\}.$$

For a map $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ we write $Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,A)$ for $(Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\cdot))(A)$ by a slight abuse of notation.

We recall from [FM99] that the $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex envelope of an upper semicontinuous function is $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex and that it is actually the largest $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex function below h.

Lemma 2.17. *If $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous, then $Q_{\mathscr{A}}h$ is upper semicontinuous and $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex. Furthermore $Q_{\mathscr{A}}h$ is the largest $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvex function below h.*

2.5. $\mathscr{D}$**-convexity.** Let $\mathscr{D}$ be a balanced cone in $\mathbb{R}^N$, i.e., we assume that $tA \in \mathscr{D}$ for all $A \in \mathscr{D}$ and every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. A real-valued function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be $\mathscr{D}$-convex provided its restrictions to all line segments in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with directions in $\mathscr{D}$ are convex. A particularly important balanced cone is the wave cone $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ for the linear PDE operator $\mathscr{A}$.

Lemma 2.18. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be a an upper semicontinuous integrand with linear growth at infinity. Further assume that h is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex. Then, h is $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$-convex.*

Corollary 2.19. *If $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous, then $(Q_{\mathscr{A}^k}h)^{\#}$ is an $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex and $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$-convex function.*

Returning to the convexity properties of $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex functions, it was recently shown by Kirchheim and Kristensen [KK11, KK16] that $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous integrands are actually *convex* at points of $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ as long as

$$\operatorname{span} \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} = \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{2.14}$$

In fact, their result is valid in the more general framework of $\mathscr{D}$-convexity:

Theorem 2.20 (Theorem 1.1 of [KK16]). *Let $\mathscr{D}$ be a balanced cone of directions in $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\mathscr{D}$ spans $\mathbb{R}^N$. If $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathscr{D}$-convex and positively 1-homogeneous,*

then h is convex at each point of $\mathscr{D}$. In particular, for each $A_0 \in \mathscr{D}$ and every probability measure $\kappa \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} A \,\mathrm{d}\kappa(A) = A_0$, the Jensen inequality

$$h(A_0) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h(A)\,\mathrm{d}\kappa(A)$$

holds.

Condition (2.14) holds in several applications, for example in the space of gradients ($\mathscr{A} = \operatorname{curl}$) or the space of divergence-free fields ($\mathscr{A} = \operatorname{div}$). However, it does not necessarily hold in our framework as is evidenced for instance by the operator

$$\mathscr{A} := A_0\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{d} A_0 \partial_{ii},$$

where $A_0 \in \operatorname{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^N;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\ker A_0 \neq \mathbb{R}^N$.

Nevertheless, for our purposes it will be sufficient to use the convexity of $f^{\#}|_{V_{\mathscr{A}}}(x,\bullet)$ in $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$, which is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.20.

Remark 2.21 (automatic convexity). Summing up, in the following we will often make use of the implications from Lemma 2.17, Corollary 2.19 and Theorem 2.20: If $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is an integrand with linear growth at infinity, then

$$f(x,\bullet) \text{ is } \mathscr{A}^k\text{-quasiconvex and u.s.c.} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} f(x,\bullet) \text{ is } \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}\text{-convex in } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and} \\ f^{\#}|_{V_{\mathscr{A}}}(x,\bullet) \text{ is convex in } \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \end{cases},$$

$$f \text{ upper semicontinuous} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f(x,\bullet) \text{ is } \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}\text{-convex in } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and} \\ (Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f)^{\#}|_{V_{\mathscr{A}}}(x,\bullet) \text{ is convex in } \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \end{cases}.$$

2.6. **Localization principles for Young measures.** We state two general localization principles for Young measures, one at *regular* points and another one at *singular* points. These are $\mathscr{A}$-free versions of the localization principles developed for gradient Young measures and BD-Young measures in [Rin11, Rin12].

Definition 2.22 ($\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure). *We say that a Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ is an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure in Ω, in symbols $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, if and only if there exists a sequence $(\mu_j) \subset \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\mathscr{A}\mu_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}$ for some $1 \leq q < d/(d-1)$, and such that*

$$\mu_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu \quad \text{in } \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

We then have the following two localization principles, whose proofs are completely analogous to the corresponding results in BV, see [Rin11, Rin12].

Proposition 2.23. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure. Then for $\mathscr{L}^d$-a.e. $x_0 \in \Omega$ there exists a regular tangent $\mathscr{A}^k$-free Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}^k}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ to ν at x_0, that is,*

$$[\sigma] \in \operatorname{Tan}_Q([\nu],x_0), \qquad \sigma_y = \nu_{x_0} \text{ a.e.},$$

$$\lambda_\sigma = \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d \in \operatorname{Tan}_Q(\lambda_\nu,x_0), \qquad \sigma_y^\infty = \nu_{x_0}^\infty \ \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e.}$$

Proposition 2.24. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure. Then there exists a set $S \subset \Omega$ with $\lambda_\nu^s(\Omega\setminus S)=0$ such that for all $x_0 \in S$ there exists a non-zero singular tangent $\mathscr{A}^k$-free Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}^k}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ to ν at x_0, that is*

$$[\sigma] \in |\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty\rangle| \cdot \mathrm{Tan}_Q([\nu],x_0), \qquad \sigma_y = \delta_0 \ a.e.,$$
$$\lambda_\sigma \in \mathrm{Tan}_Q(\lambda_\nu^s,x_0), \qquad \lambda_\sigma(Q)=1, \qquad \sigma_y^\infty = \nu_{x_0}^\infty \ \lambda_\sigma\text{-}a.e.$$

3. Jensen inequalities

In this section we establish generalized Jensen inequalities, which can be understood as a local manifestation of lower semicontinuity. If in Theorem 1.2, assumption (1.4) is replaced by the stronger

$$f^\infty(x,A) := \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{f(x,tA)}{t} \quad \text{exists for all} \quad (x,A)\in \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N,$$

the proof of the lower semicontinuity theorems at singular points will easily follow from Propositions 1.3 and 3.3, by the very same argument used in the proof of (4.2) below.

On the other hand, to prove the Theorem 1.2 only assuming (1.4) requires to perform a direct blow-up argument for what concerns the regular part of μ and only Proposition 3.3 is used in the proof. Nevertheless, we state both Jensen inequalities since we believe them to be of independent interest.

3.1. Jensen inequality at regular points.

We first consider regular points.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure. Then, for $\mathscr{L}^d$-almost every $x_0\in\Omega$ it holds that*

$$h\left(\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0}\rangle + \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty\rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right) \le \langle h, \nu_{x_0}\rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu_{x_0}^\infty\rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0),$$

for all upper semicontinuous and $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex $h\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to [0,+\infty)$ with linear growth at infinity.

Proof. We make use of Lemma 2.9 to get a collection $\{h_m\}\subset \mathbf{E}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $h_m \downarrow h$, $h_m^\infty \downarrow h^\#$ pointwise in Ω and $\overline{\Omega}$ respectively, all h_m are Lipschitz continuous and have uniformly bounded linear growth constants. Fix $x_0\in\Omega$ such that there exists a regular tangent measure $\sigma\in\mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}^k}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ of ν at x_0 as in Proposition 2.23, which is possible for $\mathscr{L}^d$-a.e. $x_0\in\Omega$. The localization principle for regular points tells us that $[\sigma]=A_0\mathscr{L}^d$ with

$$A_0 := \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0}\rangle + \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty\rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) \quad \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Furthermore, we know that σ is generated, up to mollifying, by a blow-up sequence $(u_j)\subset \mathrm{L}^2(Q,\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}^k u_j \to 0 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q) \qquad \text{and} \qquad u_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \sigma \quad \text{in } \mathbf{Y}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

In particular, we may find a cube $Q_r := rQ$ for some $r\in(0,1)$ with the following properties: $u_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} [\sigma]$ in $\mathscr{M}(Q_r;\mathbb{R}^N)$, $|u_j| \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \Lambda$ in $\mathscr{M}(\overline{Q_r})$ and $\Lambda(\partial Q_r)=0$. We may now apply Lemma 2.14 (up to re-scaling the cube Q_r into the cube Q) to the sequences (u_j) and $v_j(x):=A_0$ to find a sequence $z_j\in \mathrm{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{per}}(Q_r;\mathbb{R}^N)\cap\ker\mathscr{A}^k$ with $\int_{Q_r} z_j\,\mathrm{d}y=0$ and such that

$$A_0\mathscr{L}^d + z_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \sigma \quad \text{in } \mathbf{Y}(Q_r;\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{3.1}$$

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We use the fact that $\int_{Q_r} z_j \, dy = 0$, (3.1) and the $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity of h, to get for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h_m, \nu_{x_0}\rangle + \langle h_m^\infty, \nu_{x_0}^\infty\rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) &= \frac{1}{|Q_r|}\langle\!\langle \mathbb{1}_{Q_r} \otimes h_m, \sigma\rangle\!\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \fint_{Q_r} h_m(A_0 + z_j(y)) \, dy \\ &\geq \limsup_{j\to\infty} \fint_{Q_r} h(A_0 + z_j(y)) \, dy \\ &\geq h(A_0).\end{aligned}$$

The result follows by letting $m \to \infty$ in the previous inequality and using the monotone convergence theorem. □

3.2. **Jensen inequality at singular points.** The strategy for *singular points* differs from the regular case as one cannot simply use the definition of $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity. The latter difficulty arises because the tangent measure at a singular point may not be a multiple of the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure.

In order to circumvent this obstacle, we will first show that the support of the singular part of the Young measures ν^∞ at singular points is contained in the subspace $V_{\mathscr{A}}$ of $\mathbb{R}^N$ (see Lemma 3.2 below). Based on this, we invoke Theorem 2.20, which states that an $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous function is actually convex at points in $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ when restricted to $V_{\mathscr{A}}$. Then, the Jensen inequality for $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measures at singular points easily follows.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}^k}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}^k$-free Young measure with $\lambda_\sigma(\partial Q) = 0$. Assume also that*

$$[\sigma] \in \mathscr{M}(Q;V_{\mathscr{A}}).$$

Then,

$$\operatorname{supp}\sigma_x^\infty \subset V_{\mathscr{A}} \cap \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \qquad \text{for } \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Proof. By definition, we may find a sequence $(\mu_j) \subset \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\mathscr{A}\mu_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q)$ for some $q \in (1, d/(d-1))$, and such that (μ_h) generates the Young measure σ. Notice that, since $\mathscr{A}^k$ is a homogeneous operator and Q is a strictly star-shaped domain, we may re-scale and mollify each μ_j into some $u_j \in \mathrm{L}^2(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the following property: the sequence (u_j) also generates σ and $\mathscr{A}u_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q)$. In particular,

$$u_j\mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} [\sigma] \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

On the other hand, $\mathscr{A}^k([\sigma]) = 0$ and for every $r > 0$ the measure $T_\#^{(0,r)}[\sigma]$ is still an $\mathscr{A}^k$-free measure. Thus, letting $r \downarrow 1$ and mollifying the measure $[\sigma]$ on a sufficiently small scale (with respect to $r-1$) we may find a sequence $(v_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^2(Q;V_{\mathscr{A}}) \cap \ker\mathscr{A}^k$ such that

$$v_j\mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} [\sigma] \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Hence,

$$u_j\mathscr{L}^d - v_j\mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N), \qquad |u_j\mathscr{L}^d| + |v_j\mathscr{L}^d| \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \Lambda \text{ in } \mathscr{M}^+(\overline{Q})$$

and $\Lambda(\partial Q) = 0$. Here, we have used that $\lambda_\sigma(\partial Q) = 0$.

We are now in position to apply Lemma 2.14 to the sequences (u_j), (v_j). There exists (possibly passing to a subsequence in the v_j's) a sequence $z_j \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}^k$ with $z_j \mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0$ and such that

$$v_j \mathscr{L}^d + z_j \mathscr{L}^d \overset{\mathbf{Y}}{\to} \sigma \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Recall from observation (2.13) that $z_j \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;V_{\mathscr{A}})$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore,

$$(v_j + z_j) \in \mathrm{L}^2(Q;V_{\mathscr{A}}) \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We conclude with an application of Lemma 2.8 (ii) to the sequence $(v_j + z_j)$, which yields

$$\operatorname{supp} \sigma^\infty_x \subset V_{\mathscr{A}} \cap \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \qquad \text{for } \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e. } x \in Q.$$

This finishes the proof. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure. Then for λ^s_ν-almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$ it holds that*

$$g(\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0}\rangle) \le \langle g, \nu^\infty_{x_0}\rangle$$

for all $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$-convex and positively 1-homogeneous functions $g \in \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. Step 1: Characterization of the support of $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measures. Let S be the set given by Proposition 2.24, which has full redλ^s_ν-measure.Further, also the set

$$S' := \left\{ x \in \Omega \,:\, \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0}\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \right\} \quad \subset \Omega$$

has full λ^s_ν-measure: Observe first that

$$[\nu]^s = \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_x\rangle \, \lambda^s_\nu(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Since $[\nu]$ is $\mathscr{A}$-free, we thus infer from Theorem 2.11 that $\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_x\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ for $|[\nu]^s|$-a.e. $x \in \Omega$. On the other hand, $\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_x\rangle = 0 \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ for λ^*_ν-a.e. $x \in \Omega$, where λ^*_ν is the singular part of λ^s_ν with respect to $|[\nu]^s|$. This shows that S' has full λ^s_ν-measure.

Fix $x_0 \in S \cap S'$ (which remains of full λ^s_ν-measure in Ω). Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}^k}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be the non-zero singular tangent Young measure to ν at x_0 provided by Proposition 2.24 and let $(u_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^1(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a blow-up sequence for σ so that

$$u_j \mathscr{L}^d \overset{\mathbf{Y}}{\to} \sigma \text{ in } \mathbf{Y}(Q_r;\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathscr{A}^k u_j \to 0 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q_r;\mathbb{R}^N) \tag{3.2}$$

for any cube Q_r of positive radius $r \in (0,1)$. Here, we use that the lower-order oscillations disappear for blow-up sequences of $\mathscr{A}$-free measures (cf. Lemma 2.15), and that the same holds for asymptotically $\mathscr{A}$-free sequences.

On the one hand, since $x_0 \in S$, it holds that

$$\sigma_y = \delta_0 \quad \mathscr{L}^d\text{-a.e.} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma^\infty_y = \nu^\infty_{x_0} \quad \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e.}$$

On the other hand, we use the fact that $x_0 \in S'$ to get

$$\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0}\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad [\sigma] = \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0}\rangle \, \lambda_\sigma \in \mathscr{M}(Q;V_{\mathscr{A}}). \tag{3.3}$$

Fix $r > 0$ with $\lambda_\sigma(Q_r) > 0$ and $\lambda_\sigma(\partial Q_r) = 0$ and note that, by (3.2) and (3.3), all the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 are satisfied. Thus, it holds that

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu^\infty_{x_0} = \operatorname{supp} \sigma^\infty_y \subset V_{\mathscr{A}} \qquad \text{for } \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e. } y \in Q_r.$$

This equality and the fact that $\lambda_\sigma(Q_r) > 0$ (recall that σ is a non-zero singular measure) yield

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu^\infty_{x_0} \subset V_{\mathscr{A}} \qquad \text{for } \lambda^s_\nu\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \Omega. \tag{3.4}$$

Step 2: Convexity of g on $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$. The Kirchheim–Kristensen Theorem 2.20 states that the restriction $g|_{V_{\mathscr{A}}} : V_{\mathscr{A}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function at points $A_0 \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$. In other words, for every probability measure $\kappa \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\langle \mathrm{id}, \kappa \rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\operatorname{supp} \kappa \subset V_{\mathscr{A}}$, the Jensen inequality

$$g\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} A \,\mathrm{d}\kappa(A)\right) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(A)\,\mathrm{d}\kappa(A)$$

holds. Hence, because of (3.3) and (3.4), it follows that

$$g(\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle) \le \langle g, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle.$$

This proves the assertion. □

The following simple corollary will be important in the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be an upper semicontinuous integrand with linear growth at infinity and let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-free Young measure. Then for $\mathscr{L}^d$-almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$ it holds that*

$$Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} h\left(\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu_{x_0} \rangle + \langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right) \le \langle h, \nu_{x_0} \rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0).$$

Moreover, for λ^s_ν-a.e. $x_0 \in \Omega$ it holds that

$$(Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} h)^\#(\langle \mathrm{id}, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle) \le \langle h^\#, \nu^\infty_{x_0} \rangle$$

Proof. The proof follows by combining Propositions 3.1 and 3.3, Lemma 2.17, Corollary 2.19 and the trivial inequalities $Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} h \le h$, $(Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} h)^\# \le h^\#$.

□

4. Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We only show the sufficiency part ($\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity implies weak* lower semicontinuity), as the other direction is well-known, see [FM99]. We will prove Theorem 1.2 in full generality, which means that we consider asymptotically $\mathscr{A}$-free sequences in the $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}$-norm for some $q \in (1, d/(d-1))$; see Remark 1.3.

For a measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, consider the functional

$$\mathscr{F}^\#[\mu; B] := \int_B f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_B f^\#\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

defined for any Borel subset $B \subset \Omega$.

Let μ_j be a sequence in $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ weakly* converging to a limit μ and assume furthermore that $\mathscr{A}\mu_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ for some $q \in (1, d/(d-1))$. Define $\lambda_j \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$ via

$$\lambda_j(B) := \mathscr{F}^\#[\mu_j; B] \qquad \text{for every Borel } B \subset \Omega.$$

We may find a (not relabeled) subsequence and positive measures $\lambda, \Lambda \in \mathscr{M}_+(\Omega)$ such that

$$\lambda_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \lambda, \quad |\mu_j| \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \Lambda \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega).$$

We claim that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) \geq f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right) \qquad \text{for } \mathscr{L}^d\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \Omega, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x_0) \geq f^{\#}\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x_0)\right) \qquad \text{for } |\mu^s|\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \Omega. \tag{4.2}$$

Notice that, if (4.1) and (4.2) hold, then the assertion of the theorem immediately follows. Indeed, $\lambda \ll \mathscr{L}^d + |\mu^s|$, and therefore

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}\mathscr{L}^d + \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}|\mu^s|.$$

Using the Radon-Nikodým theorem, we then obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\#}[\mu_j] &= \liminf_{j\to\infty} \lambda_j(\Omega) \\
&\geq \lambda(\Omega) \\
&= \int_\Omega \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}\,\mathrm{d}|\mu^s| \\
&\geq \int_\Omega f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega f^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right)\mathrm{d}|\mu^s| \\
&= \mathscr{F}^{\#}[\mu].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

With (4.1), (4.2), which are proved below, the result follows. □

The following lemma will be used in the proof of (4.1).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $R > 0$ be such that $Q_{2R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Then, for every $r \in (0,R)$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence $(u_h^{(r,j)})_h \subset \mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_h^{(r,j)} \to \mu_j \quad \textit{area-strictly in } \mathscr{M}(Q_r(x_0);\mathbb{R}^N) \qquad \textit{as } h\to\infty \qquad \textit{and} \\
&\|\mathscr{A}u_h^{(r,j)} - \mathscr{A}\mu_j\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q_r(x_0))} \to 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Fix $r \in (0,R)$ and let $\{\rho_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ be standard family of smooth mollifiers. The sequence defined by

$$u_h^{(r,j)} := \mathbb{1}_{Q_r(x_0)} \cdot (\mu_j * \rho_{1/h}) \quad \in \mathrm{C}^\infty(\overline{Q_r(x_0)};\mathbb{R}^N).$$

satisfies all the conclusion properties. Indeed, that

$$\|\mathscr{A}u_h^{(r,j)} - \mathscr{A}\mu_j\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q_r(x_0))} \to 0$$

is an immediate consequence of the properties of mollification and Remark 2.2 □

Proof of (4.1). We employ the classical blow-up method to organize the proof. We know from Lebesgue's differentiation theorem and (2.5) that the properties

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) = \lim_{r\downarrow 0}\frac{\lambda(Q_r(x_0))}{r^d} < \infty, \qquad \lim_{r\downarrow 0}\frac{|\mu^s|(Q_r(x_0))}{r^d} < \infty,$$

$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{r^d}\int_{Q_r(x_0)}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x) - \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right|\mathrm{d}x = 0,$$

$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{r^d}\int_{Q_r}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}\Lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x) - \frac{\mathrm{d}\Lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right|\mathrm{d}x = 0,$$

and

$$\mathrm{Tan}(\mu,x_0)=\left\{\alpha\cdot\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d\ :\ \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\cup\{0\}\right\},\tag{4.5}$$

hold at almost every x_0 in Ω, henceforth fixed.

From a change of variables, we infer that for almost every $r\in(0,1)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname*{w^*\text{-}lim}_{j\to\infty}\operatorname*{w^*\text{-}lim}_{h\to\infty}\big[r^d u_h^{(r,j)}(x_0+ry)\,\mathscr{L}^d_y\big]&=\operatorname*{w^*\text{-}lim}_{j\to\infty}\operatorname*{w^*\text{-}lim}_{h\to\infty}T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}[u_h^{(r,j)}\mathscr{L}^d]\\&=\operatorname*{w^*\text{-}lim}_{j\to\infty}T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}\mu_j\\&=T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}\mu,\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

where the weak* convergence is to be understood in $\mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$. Thus, choosing a sequence $r\downarrow 0$ with $\lambda_j(\partial Q_r(x_0))=0$ and $\Lambda(\partial Q_r(x_0))=0$, we get from the same change of variables that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)&=\lim_{r\to0}\lim_{j\to\infty}\frac{\lambda_j(Q_r(x_0))}{r^d}\\&=\lim_{r\to0}\lim_{j\to\infty}\frac{\mathscr{F}^{\#}[\mu_j;Q_r(x_0)]}{r^d}\\&\geq\lim_{r\to0}\lim_{j\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty}\frac{\mathscr{F}^{\#}[u_h^{(r,j)}\mathscr{L}^d;Q_r(x_0)]}{r^d}\\&=\lim_{r\to0}\lim_{j\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty}\int_Q f\big(x_0+ry,u_h^{(r,j)}(x_0+ry)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y,\end{aligned}$$

where we used Corollary 2.10 and Remark 2.7 for the "$\geq$" estimate. Since $y\mapsto u_h^{(r,j)}(x_0+ry)$ is the density of the measure $r^{-d}T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}[u_h^{(r,j)}\mathscr{L}^d]$ with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$, we may use a suitable diagonalization procedure to find $u_r:=u_{h(r)}^{(r,j(r))}$ with

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\geq\lim_{r\to0}\int_Q f\left(x_0+ry,\frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma_r}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(y)\right)\mathrm{d}y,\tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\gamma_r:=r^{-d}T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}[u_r\,\mathscr{L}^d]$$

Owing to (4.4), (4.6) and Proposition 2.15, we may further assume that, as $r\downarrow0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_r\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}\sigma\qquad\text{for some }\sigma\in\mathrm{Tan}_Q(\mu,x_0),\\&\|\mathscr{A}^k u_r\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}}\to0.\end{aligned}$$

In fact, σ is also the blow-up limit of the sequence

$$r^{-d}T^{(x_0,r)}_{\#}\mu=\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0+ry)\,\mathscr{L}^d_y.$$

It follows from (2.3), (4.5) and (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_r-\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup}0\quad\text{in }\mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N),\\&\mathscr{A}^k\left(\gamma_r-\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d\right)\to0\quad\text{in }\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N).\end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to apply Proposition 2.14, whereby there exists a sequence $(z_r) \subset \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A} z_r = 0, \qquad \int_Q z_r = 0, \qquad z_r \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathscr{M}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

and (up to taking a subsequence) the sequence $\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\,\mathscr{L}^d + z_r\right)$ generates the same Young measure as (γ_r).

Returning to the calculations in (4.7), we use the properties of the sequence (z_r) and the $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity of $f(x_0 + ry, \cdot)$ to obtain the desired lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) &\geq \lim_{r\to 0} \int_Q f\left(x_0 + ry, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) + z_r(y)\right) \mathrm{d}y \\
&\geq \lim_{r\to 0} \int_Q f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) + z_r(y)\right) \\
&\qquad - \lim_{r\to 0}\left[\omega(r)\left(|\Omega| + \left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) + z_r\right\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)}\right)\right] \\
&\geq f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right). \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.1). □

Remark 4.2. If the assumption that $f(x,\cdot)$ is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex is dropped and one additionally assumes that f is continuous, one can still show that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) \geq Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0)\right).$$

Indeed, so far the $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity of $f(x,\cdot)$ has only been used in the last inequality of (4.8) where one can first use the inequality $f(x,\cdot) \geq Q_{\mathscr{A}^k}(x,\cdot)$ to get

$$\int_Q f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) + z_r(y)\right) \geq \int_Q Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x_0) + z_r(y)\right).$$

The assertion then follows by using the $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvexity of $Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f(x,\cdot)$.

Proof of (4.2). Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\mu_j \overset{\mathbf{Y}}{\to} \nu \quad \text{for some } \nu \in \mathbf{Y}_{\mathscr{A}}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N).$$

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\nu_j := \delta[\mu_j] \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, the elementary Young measure corresponding to μ_j, so that $\nu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nu$ in $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$. Define the functional

$$\mathscr{F}_{\#}[\sigma;B] := \int_B \langle f(x,\cdot), \sigma_x\rangle \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\overline{B}} \langle f_{\#}(x,\cdot), \sigma_x^\infty\rangle \lambda_\nu(x), \qquad \sigma \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

where $B \subset \Omega$ is an open set. Observe that, as a functional defined on $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathscr{F}_{\#}$ is sequentially weakly* lower semicontinuous (see Remark 2.7). We use the fact, proved in (3.4), that

$$f^{\#}(x,\cdot) \equiv f_{\#}(x,\cdot) \quad \text{on } V_{\mathscr{A}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{supp} \nu_x^\infty \subset V_{\mathscr{A}} \quad \text{for } \lambda_\nu^s\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

to get (recall $f \geq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{F}[\mu_j;B] &\geq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{F}_{\#}[\nu_j;B]\\ &\geq \mathscr{F}_{\#}[\nu;B]\\ &\geq \int_B \left(\langle f(x,\cdot),\nu_x\rangle + \langle f_{\#}(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x\\ &\qquad + \int_B \langle f_{\#}(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu^s(x)\\ &\geq \int_B \langle f^{\#}(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu^s(x). \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Recall that, for every $x \in \Omega$, the function $f(x,\cdot)$ is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex and hence the function $f^{\#}(x,\cdot)$ is $\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$-convex and positively 1-homogeneous. An application of the Jensen-type inequality from Proposition 3.3 to the last line yields

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{F}[\mu_j;B] \geq \int_B f^{\#}(x,\langle \mathrm{id},\nu_x^\infty\rangle)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu^s(x).$$

Thus, also taking into account $|\mu^s| = |\langle \mathrm{id},\nu_x^\infty\rangle|\,\lambda_\nu^s$ and $f^{\#}(x,\langle \mathrm{id},\nu_x^\infty\rangle) = f^{\#}(x,0) = 0$ for λ_ν^*-a.e. $x \in \Omega$, where λ_ν^* is the singular part of λ_ν^s with respect to $|\mu^s|$, we get

$$\lambda(B) \geq \int_B f^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

for all open sets $B \subset \Omega$ with $\lambda_\nu^s(\partial B) = 0$, hence, by the Besicovitch differentiation theorem,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x_0) \geq f^{\#}\left(x_0, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x_0)\right) \qquad \text{for } |\mu^s|\text{-a.e. } x_0 \in \Omega.$$

This proves (4.2). □

Remark 4.3 (recession functions). The only part of the proof where we use the existence of $f^\infty(x,A)$, for $x \in \Omega$ and $A \in V_{\mathscr{A}}$, is in showing that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}_{\#}[\nu;B] \geq \int_B &\left(\langle f(x,\cdot),\nu_x\rangle + \langle f_{\#}(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x\\ &+ \int_B \langle f^{\#}(x,\cdot),\nu_x^\infty\rangle \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_\nu^s(x)\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.4. If we additionally assume that $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is (jointly) continuous and drop the assumption that $f(x,\cdot)$ is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex for every $x \in \Omega$, we can still show, for

$$\overline{\mathscr{F}}[\mu] := \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f)^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

that

$$\overline{\mathscr{F}}[\mu] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{F}[\mu_j]$$

for every sequence $\mu_j \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu$ in $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\mathscr{A}\mu_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega)$. The proof of this fact follows directly from Remark 4.2, the last line of (4.9), and Corollary 3.4. Observe that one does not require the existence of $(Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f)^\infty$ in $\Omega \times \operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Note that in the proof of (4.1) we did not use that f^∞ exists in $\Omega \times \operatorname{span}\Lambda_{\mathscr{A}}$. By the very same argument as in (4.3), is easy to check that Theorem 1.4 is an immediate consequence of (4.1).

□

5. Proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7

We use standard machinery to show the relaxation theorems. Recall that, as part of the main assumptions, $\mathscr{A}$ here is a homogeneous partial differential operator.

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.6.** We divide the proof of Theorem 1.6 into three steps. First, we prove that any $\mathscr{A}$-free measure may be area-strictly approximated by $\mathscr{A}$-free absolutely continuous measures. Next, we prove the upper bound on absolutely continuous measures, from which the general upper bound follows by approximation. We conclude by observing that the proposed upper bound is weakly* lower semicontinuous by a corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Step 1. The lower bound. The lower bound $\overline{\mathscr{G}} \geq \mathscr{G}_*$, where

$$\mathscr{G}_*[\mu] := \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}} f)^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x),$$

is a direct consequence of Remark 4.4 and the fact that $\mathscr{A}$ is a homogeneous partial differential operator.

Step 2. An area-strictly converging recovery sequence. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$. We will show that there exists a sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ for which

$$u_j\mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu \text{ in } \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \langle u_j\mathscr{L}^d\rangle(\Omega) \to \langle\mu\rangle(\Omega),$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathscr{A}u_j \to 0 \text{ in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega).$$

Let $\{\varphi_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$ be a locally finite partition of unity of Ω. Set

$$\mu_{(i)} := \mu\varphi_i \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

and

$$\mu^a_{(i)} := \mu^a\varphi_i \qquad \mu^s_{(i)} := \mu^s\varphi_i.$$

where, as usual,

$$\mu^a = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}\mathscr{L}^d \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu^s = \mu - \mu^a.$$

Note that, with a slight abuse of notation,

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{j} \mu^a_{(i)} - \mu^a\right\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } j \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, for fixed i,

$$\mu_{(i)} * \rho_\varepsilon \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu_{(i)}, \qquad |\mu_{(i)} * \rho_\varepsilon|(\Omega) \leq |\mu_{(i)}|(\Omega) \leq \int_\Omega \varphi_i \,\mathrm{d}|\mu|, \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\mu^a_{(i)} * \rho_\varepsilon \to \mu^a_{(i)} \quad \text{in } \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega) \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Moreover

$$\mathscr{A}(\mu_{(i)} * \rho_\varepsilon) \to \mathscr{A}\mu_{(i)} \quad \text{in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

By a diagonal argument, we can thus find $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ such that, setting $\mu_i = \mu_{(i)} * \rho_{\varepsilon_i}$, $\mu_i^a = \mu_{(i)}^a * \rho_{\varepsilon_i}$, and

$$u_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} \mu_i + \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} \mu_{(i)}, \qquad u_j^a = \sum_{i=1}^{j} \mu_i^a + \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} \mu_{(i)}^a,$$

we get

$$u_j \mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu, \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\left\| u_j^a - \mu^a \right\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)} \to 0, \tag{5.3}$$

as $j \to \infty$. Moreover, since $\mathscr{A}\mu = 0$, the ε_i's can be chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{A} u_j\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega)} &= \|\mathscr{A} u_j - \mathscr{A}\mu\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} \|\mathscr{A}(\mu_i - \mu_{(i)})\|_{\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega)} \to 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

as $j \to \infty$. Note that $u_j \in \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, hence, thanks to (5.2) and (5.4), to conclude it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \langle u_j \mathscr{L}^d \rangle(\Omega) = \langle \mu \rangle(\Omega). \tag{5.5}$$

For this, observe that (5.1) and that fact that $\{\varphi_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a partition of unity imply that

$$\int_\Omega |u_j| \, \mathrm{d}x \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega \varphi_i \, \mathrm{d}|\mu| \leq |\mu|(\Omega).$$

Thus, by also exploiting (5.3),

$$\int_\Omega |u_j - u_j^a| \, \mathrm{d}x \to |\mu^s|(\Omega) \quad \text{as } j \to \infty. \tag{5.6}$$

By the inequality $\sqrt{1+|z|^2} \leq \sqrt{1+|z-w|^2} + |w|$ (for $z, w \in \mathbb{R}^N$), we get

$$\langle u_j \mathscr{L}^d \rangle(\Omega) \leq \langle u_j^a \mathscr{L}^d \rangle(\Omega) + \int_\Omega |u_j - u_j^a| \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Hence, again by (5.3) and (5.6)

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \langle u_j \mathscr{L}^d \rangle(\Omega) \leq \langle \mu \rangle(\Omega). \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand, by the weak* convergence $u_j \mathscr{L}^d \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu$ and the convexity of $z \mapsto \sqrt{1+|z|^2}$,

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \langle u_j \mathscr{L}^d \rangle(\Omega) \geq \langle \mu \rangle(\Omega).$$

Thus, together with (5.7), (5.5) follows, concluding the proof of the claim.

Step 3.a. Upper bound on absolutely continuous fields. Let us now turn to the derivation of the upper bound for $\overline{\mathscr{G}}[u] = \overline{\mathscr{G}}[u\mathscr{L}^d]$ where $u \in \mathrm{C}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$. For now let us assume additionally the following strengthening of (1.5):

$$f(x,A) - f(y,A) \leq \omega(|x-y|)(1+f(y,A)) \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in \Omega,\ A \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{5.8}$$

It holds that $Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f(x,\cdot)$ is still Lipschitz in the second variable and

$$Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\cdot)(A) \leq Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(y,\cdot)(A) + \omega(|x-y|)(1+|A|) \tag{5.9}$$

for every $x, y \in \Omega$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with a new modulus of continuity, which incorporates another multiplicative constant in comparison to the original ω.

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider a partition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ of cubes of side length $1/m$. Let $\{Q_i^m\}_{i=1}^{L(m)}$ be the maximal collection of those cubes that are compactly contained in Ω and note that, by the assumption $\mathscr{L}^d(\partial\Omega) = 0$, we have that:

$$\mathscr{L}^d(\Omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \mathscr{L}^d(Q_i^h) + \mathrm{o}_m(1),$$

where $\mathrm{o}_m(1) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

We may approximate u strongly in L^1 by functions $z^m \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ which are piecewise constant on the mesh $\{Q_i^m\}_{i=1}^{L(m)}$ (as $m \to \infty$). More specifically, we may find functions $z^m \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $z^m = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \cup_i Q_i^m$,

$$z^m = z_i^m \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{on } Q_i^m \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|u - z^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)} = \mathrm{o}_m(1). \tag{5.10}$$

Additionally, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we may find functions $w_i^m \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{per}}(Q;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$ with the following properties

$$\int_Q f(x_i, z_i^m + w_i^m(y))\,\mathrm{d}y \le Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x_i, z_i^m) + \frac{1}{m}, \qquad \int_Q w_i^m = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varphi_m \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_c(Q;[0,1])$ be a function such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \|(1-\varphi_m) w_i^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(Q)} = \frac{1}{m}, \tag{5.12}$$

We define the functions

$$v_j^m := \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \varphi_m(m(x-x_i)) \cdot w_i^m(jmx) \qquad x \in \Omega,\ j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, the sequence (v_j^m) generates the Young measure

$$\nu^m = (\overline{\delta_{g^m}}, 0, \delta_0) \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N),$$

where $g^m : \Omega \times Q \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is given by

$$(x,y) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \varphi_m(m(x-x_i)) \cdot w_i^m(y)$$

and the averaging is to be understood with respect to y.

By the compact embedding $\mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \overset{c}{\hookrightarrow} \mathrm{W}^{-1,q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, and the fact that

$$\mathscr{A}[w_j^m(jmx)] = 0$$

(here we have used that $\mathscr{A}$ is homogeneous), we further get

$$\mathscr{A} v_j^m \to 0 \quad \text{strongly in } \mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \text{as } j \to \infty.$$

Remark 5.1. By construction, for every $m, j \in \mathbb{N}$, the function v_j^m is compactly supported in Ω. Up to re-scaling, we may thus assume without loss of generality that $\Omega \subset Q$ and subsequently make use of Lemma 2.14 on the j-indexed sequence $(\tilde{v}_j^m)$ with m fixed, where $\tilde{v}_j^m$ is the zero extension of v_j^m to Q, to find another sequence $(V_j^m) \subset \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$ generating the same Young measure ν^m (as $j \to \infty$).

In the next calculation we use the Lipschitz continuity of $Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\cdot)$ in the second variable, equation (5.10) and the fact that the sequence (v_j^m) generates the Young measure ν^m as j goes to infinity, to get

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{G}[u+v_j^m] &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{G}[z^m+v_j^m] + \mathrm{o}_m(1)\\ &= \langle\!\langle f, \nu^m \rangle\!\rangle + \mathrm{o}_m(1)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \int_{Q_i^m}\int_Q f\big(x, z_i^m + \varphi_m(m(x-x_i))\cdot w_i^m(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \mathrm{o}_m(1). \quad (5.13)\end{aligned}$$

By a change of variables we can estimate the integrand on the last line on each cube of the mesh:

$$\begin{aligned}&\fint_{Q_i^m}\int_Q f\big(x, z_i^m + \varphi_m(m(x-x_i))\cdot w_i^m(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad= \int_Q\int_Q f\big(x_i + m^{-1}x, z_i^m + \varphi_m(x)\cdot w_i^m(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad\le \int_Q\int_Q f\big(x_i + m^{-1}x, z_i^m + w_i^m(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \mathrm{Lip}(f)\|(1-\varphi_m)w_i^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(Q)}\\ &\quad= \fint_{Q_i^m}\int_Q f(x, z_i^m + w_i^m(y))\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \mathrm{Lip}(f)\|(1-\varphi_m)w_i^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(Q)}\\ &\quad:= I_i^m + II_i^m. \quad (5.14)\end{aligned}$$

Using the modulus of continuity of f from (5.8), (5.11) (twice), and $Q_{\mathscr{A}} f \le f$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}I_i^m &\le \fint_{Q_i^m}\int_Q f(x_i, z_i^m + w_i^m(y))\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x + \omega(m^{-1})\left(1 + \int_Q f(x_i, z_i^m + w_i^m(y))\,\mathrm{d}y\right)\\ &\le Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x_i, z_i^m) + \omega(m^{-1})(1 + f(x_i, z_i^m)) + \mathrm{o}_m(1). \quad (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, by (5.12)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \mathscr{L}^d(Q_i^m) II_i^m = \mathscr{L}^d(\Omega)\mathrm{o}_m(1). \quad (5.16)$$

Returning to (5.13), we can employ (5.9), (5.14), (5.15) and (5.16) to further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{G}[u+v_j^m]\\ &\quad\le \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \left\{ \int_{Q_i^m} Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x_i, z_i^m)\,\mathrm{d}x + \omega(m^{-1})\left(\int_{Q_i^m} 1 + f(x_i, z_i^m)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)\right\} + \mathrm{o}_m(1)\\ &\quad\le \sum_{i=1}^{L(m)} \left\{ \int_{Q_i^m} Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x, z_i^m)\,\mathrm{d}x + C\omega(m^{-1})\left(\int_{Q_i^m} 1 + |z_i^m|\,\mathrm{d}x\right)\right\} + \mathrm{o}_m(1)\\ &\quad\le \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x, z^m)\,\mathrm{d}x + C\omega(m^{-1})\big(\|1 + |z^m|\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)}\big) + \mathrm{o}_m(1)\\ &\quad= \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}x + \mathrm{o}_m(1).\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the (inherited) Lipschitz continuity of $Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\cdot)$ in the second variable and the fact that $\|u - z^m\|_{\mathrm{L}^1(\Omega)} = \mathrm{o}_m(1)$ to pass to the last equality. Hence

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[u] \le \inf_{m>0} \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathscr{G}[u+v_j^m] \le \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}x. \quad (5.17)$$

Step 3.b. The upper bound. Fix $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$. By Step 2 we may find a sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ that area-strictly converges to $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\mathscr{A}u_j \to 0$ in $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}$. Hence, by (5.17), Remark 2.7 and Corollary 2.10,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathscr{G}}[\mu] &\leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \overline{\mathscr{G}}[u_j] \\
&\leq \limsup_{j\to\infty} \left\langle\!\left\langle Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\bullet), \delta[u_j\mathscr{L}^d] \right\rangle\!\right\rangle \\
&\leq \int_\Omega \langle Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\bullet), \delta[\mu]_x \rangle \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle (Q_{\mathscr{A}} f(x,\bullet))^{\#}, \delta[\mu]_x^\infty \rangle \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\delta[\mu]}(x) \\
&= \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}} f)^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x) \\
&= \mathscr{G}_*[\mu].
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. Weakening of continuity condition. It remains to show the upper bound in the case where we only have (1.5) instead of (5.8). As in the previous step, it suffices to show the upper bound on absolutely continuous fields. We let, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$f^\varepsilon(x,A) := f(x,A) + \varepsilon|A|,$$

which is an integrand satisfying (5.8). Denote the corresponding functionals with f^ε in place of f by $\mathscr{G}^\varepsilon, \mathscr{G}^\varepsilon_*, \overline{\mathscr{G}^\varepsilon}$. Then, by the argument in Steps 1–3,

$$\mathscr{G}^\varepsilon_* = \overline{\mathscr{G}^\varepsilon}.$$

We claim that

$$Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f^\varepsilon \downarrow Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f \qquad \text{pointwise in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{5.18}$$

To see this first notice that $\varepsilon \mapsto Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f^\varepsilon(x,A)$ is monotone decreasing for all $x \in \Omega$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and

$$Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f + \varepsilon|\bullet| \leq Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f^\varepsilon \leq f + \varepsilon|\bullet|,$$

which is a simple consequence of Jensen's classical inequality for $|\bullet|$. It follows that the limit

$$g(x,A) := \inf_{\varepsilon>0} Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f^\varepsilon(x,A) = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f^\varepsilon(x,A)$$

defines an upper semicontinuous function $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ with bounds

$$Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f \leq g \leq f.$$

Furthermore, by the monotone convergence theorem, it is easy to check that g is $\mathscr{A}^k$-quasiconvex, whereby $g = Q_{\mathscr{A}^k} f$ (see Corollary 2.17).

Let us now return to the proof of the upper bound on absolutely continuous fields. By construction,

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}} \leq \overline{\mathscr{G}^\varepsilon} = \mathscr{G}^\varepsilon_*. \tag{5.19}$$

The monotone convergence theorem and (5.18) yield

$$\overline{\mathscr{G}}[u] \leq \mathscr{G}_*[u\mathscr{L}^d] \qquad \text{for all } u \in \mathrm{L}^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A},$$

after letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in (5.19).

The general upper bound then follows by a similar token to one where we assumed (5.8). This finishes the proof. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.7.** The proof carries out similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.6 with the following additional comments:

Step 1. The lower bound. Since restricting to $\mathscr{A}$-free sequences is a particular case of the more general convergence $\mathscr{A}u_n \to 0$ in the space $\mathrm{W}^{-k,q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$, we can still apply Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 1.6 to prove that $\mathscr{G}_* \leq \overline{\mathscr{G}}$, where for $\mu \in \mathscr{M}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \ker \mathscr{A}$,

$$\mathscr{G}_*[\mu] := \int_\Omega Q_{\mathscr{A}} f\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (Q_{\mathscr{A}} f)^{\#}\left(x, \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu^s}{\mathrm{d}|\mu^s|}(x)\right) \mathrm{d}|\mu^s|(x).$$

Step 2. An $\mathscr{A}$-free strictly convergent recovery sequence. In this case, this forms part of the assumptions.

Step 3.a. Upper bound on absolutely continuous $\mathscr{A}$-free fields. An immediate consequence of Remark 5.1 is that one may assume, without loss of generality, that the recovery sequence for the upper bound lies in $\ker \mathscr{A}$. Thus, the upper bound on absolutely continuous fields in the constrained setting also holds.

Step 3.b. The upper bound (assuming (5.8)). The proof is the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Step 4. Weakening of continuity condition. Since assumption (5.8) is a structural property (coercivity) of the integrand and the arguments do not depend on the underlying space of measures, the argument remains the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

REFERENCES

[AB97] J. J. Alibert and G. Bouchitté, *Non-uniform integrability and generalized Young measures*, J. Convex Anal. **4** (1997), 129–147.

[AD92] L. Ambrosio and G. Dal Maso, *On the relaxation in* $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega;\mathbf{R}^m)$ *of quasi-convex integrals*, J. Funct. Anal. **109** (1992), 76–97.

[AFP00] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free-Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2000.

[AR16] A. Arroyo-Rabasa, *Relaxation and optimization for linear-growth convex integral functionals under PDE constraints*, arXiv:1603.01310, 2016.

[BCMS13] M. Baía, M. Chermisi, J. Matias, and P. M. Santos, *Lower semicontinuity and relaxation of signed functionals with linear growth in the context of $\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvexity*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **47** (2013), 465–498.

[BFT00] A. C. Barroso, I. Fonseca, and R. Toader, *A relaxation theorem in the space of functions of bounded deformation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **29** (2000), 19–49.

[Bil03] M. Bildhauer, *Convex variational problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1818, Springer, 2003.

[BM84] J. M. Ball and F. Murat, *$W^{1,p}$-quasiconvexity and variational problems for multiple integrals*, J. Funct. Anal. **58** (1984), no. 3, 225–253.

[Dac82] B. Dacorogna, *Weak Continuity and Weak Lower Semicontinuity for Nonlinear Functionals*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 922, Springer, 1982.

[DiP85] R. J. DiPerna, *Compensated compactness and general systems of conservation laws*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **292** (1985), 383–420.

[DM87] R. J. DiPerna and A. J. Majda, *Oscillations and concentrations in weak solutions of the incompressible fluid equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **108** (1987), 667–689.

[DR16a] G. De Philippis and F. Rindler, *Characterization of generalized Young measures generated by symmetric gradients*, arXiv:1604.04097, 2016.

[DR16b] ———, *On the structure of $\mathscr{A}$-free measures and applications*, Ann. of Math. **184** (2016), 1017–1039.

[FLM04] I. Fonseca, G. Leoni, and S. Müller, *$\mathscr{A}$-quasiconvexity: weak-star convergence and the gap*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **21** (2004), no. 2, 209–236.

[FM93] I. Fonseca and S. Müller, *Relaxation of quasiconvex functionals in* $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega,\mathbf{R}^p)$ *for integrands* $f(x,u,\nabla u)$, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **123** (1993), 1–49.

[FM99] ———, *$\mathcal{A}$-quasiconvexity, lower semicontinuity, and Young measures*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **30** (1999), 1355–1390.

[KK11] B. Kirchheim and J. Kristensen, *Automatic convexity of rank-1 convex functions*, Comptes Rendus Mathematique **349** (2011), 407–409.

[KK16] ———, *On rank-one convex functions that are homogeneous of degree one*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **221** (2016), 527–558.

[KR10a] J. Kristensen and F. Rindler, *Characterization of generalized gradient Young measures generated by sequences in $W^{1,1}$ and BV*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **197** (2010), 539–598, Erratum: Vol. 203 (2012), 693-700.

[KR10b] ———, *Relaxation of signed integral functionals in BV*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **37** (2010), 29–62.

[Mat95] P. Mattila, *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[Mor66] C. B. Morrey, Jr., *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 130, Springer, 1966.

[Mül87] Stefan Müller, *Homogenization of nonconvex integral functionals and cellular elastic materials*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **99** (1987), no. 3, 189–212.

[Mur78] F. Murat, *Compacité par compensation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **5** (1978), 489–507.

[Mur79] ———, *Compacité par compensation. II*, Proceedings of the International Meeting on Recent Methods in Nonlinear Analysis (Rome, 1978), Pitagora, 1979, pp. 245–256.

[Mur81] ———, *Compacité par compensation: condition nécessaire et suffisante de continuité faible sous une hypothèse de rang constant*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **8** (1981), 69–102.

[Pre87] D. Preiss, *Geometry of measures in* $\mathbf{R}^n$*: distribution, rectifiability, and densities*, Ann. of Math. **125** (1987), 537–643.

[Rin11] F. Rindler, *Lower semicontinuity for integral functionals in the space of functions of bounded deformation via rigidity and Young measures*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **202** (2011), 63–113.

[Rin12] ———, *Lower semicontinuity and Young measures in BV without Alberti's Rank-One Theorem*, Adv. Calc. Var. **5** (2012), 127–159.

[Tar79] L. Tartar, *Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations*, Nonlinear analysis and mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium, Vol. IV, Res. Notes in Math., vol. 39, Pitman, 1979, pp. 136–212.

[Tar83] ———, *The compensated compactness method applied to systems of conservation laws*, Systems of nonlinear partial differential equations (Oxford, 1982), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 111, Reidel, 1983, pp. 263–285.

A.A.-R.: INSTITUT FÜR ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BONN, 53115 BONN, GERMANY.

E-mail address: adolfo.arroyo.rabasa@hcm.uni-bonn.de

G.D.P: SISSA, VIA BONOMEA 265, 34136 TRIESTE, ITALY.

E-mail address: guido.dephilippis@sissa.it

F.R.: MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY CV4 7AL, UK.

E-mail address: F.Rindler@warwick.ac.uk